

Appl. No. 10/678,278
In re Concialdi et al.
Reply to Final Office Action of Apr. 15, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the Final Official Action dated April 15, 2005. This amendment and request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

Claims 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trudell (USPN 4,116,303). Claims 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trudell.

Claims 12 and 14 were objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 11. The Examiner however noted that claims 12 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitation of the base claim 11 and any intervening claims.

In order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, claim 11 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 12. No new matter has been added. Claim 12 has been canceled. Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 11 and 13 solely to present it in independent form. Thus, claims 11 and 13-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-10 were allowed.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 and 13-20 define the invention

Appl. No. 10/678,278

In re Concialdi et al.

Reply to Final Office Action of Apr. 15, 2005

over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claim language would expedite prosecution they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted:
Liniak, Berenato & White

By: 

George Ayvazov
Reg. No. 37,483

6550 Rock Spring Drive, Suite 240
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Tel. (301) 896-0600
Fax (301) 896-0607